UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,345	08/14/2008	**Martin Bohn**	23680	7149

535 7590 07/29/2010

KF ROSS PC
5683 RIVERDALE AVENUE
SUITE 203 BOX 900
BRONX, NY 10471-0900

EXAMINER	
PARVEZ, AZM A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3729	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/29/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

EMAIL@KFRPC.COM
ereyes@kfrpc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/588,345	BOHN, MARTIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AZM PARVEZ	3729	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 June 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *30-34,38-48 and 50-52* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *30-34,38,39,41-43,46-48 and 50-52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *40,44 and 45* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 39 , 47 and 48 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 39, line 3; "of", in claim 47, line 3 "of" ; and in claim 48, line 2; "of" are not clearly understood. Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claim 46 is objected to under 37 CFR1.75(c) as being in improper form because it is dependent on claim 37, which is cancelled. Appropriate correction is required

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Examiner could not find in the specification the claim language of claim 1 "a predetermined uniform antenna spacing that is substantially greater than the module spacing" and is not supported in the specification of page 19; line 15-17. Examiner also could not find in the specification the exact claim language of claim 1" releasably adhering a mounting strip to an outer face of the antenna strip". Appropriate correction is required.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir.1999). The term "turned away from" in claim 50 is used by the claim to mean "other side", while the accepted meaning is "turned the other way." The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly define the term.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 30 , 31, 38, 39, 41-43 and 50 - 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas Grasl et al., DE 10205914, and further in view of Chung , US 6,886,246.

9. Regarding claim 30, 39 and 50, Thomas Grasl et al. discloses;

A method of making electronic components each having a chip module (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 4) **with module contacts** (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 5) **and an antenna** (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 2) **having antenna contacts**

(see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 3)**, the method comprising the steps of:**

securing chip modules (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 4) **to the inner face of an elongated module film** (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 6) **strip having an outer periphery projecting past the chip module ;**

securing the antennas (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 1; 2) **to an inner face of an elongated antenna strip** (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 1b)

releasably adhering a mounting strip (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 1a) **to an outer face of the antenna strip;**

pressing the film sections against the antenna strip such that the module contacts (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 5) **of each of the chip modules engage and bear on the antenna contacts** (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 3) **of a respective antenna; and**

bonding the outer periphery of each of the film sections to the inner face of the antenna strip generally all around each the chip modules(see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 6) **.**

Thomas Grasl et al. does not discloses

plurality of the chip modules, plurality of the antennas, with the chip modules spaced from one another on the module film strip at a uniform predetermined module spacing; with the antennas spaced from one another by a predetermined distance that is substantially greater than the module spacing; longitudinally subdividing the film strip into film sections each of which is of a length equal to the predetermined module spacing and each of which carries a

respective chip module;

However Chung teaches

plurality of the chip modules or antennas (see Chung Fig 3; 212) **, the chip modules spaced from one another on the module film strip**(see Chung Fig 3; 212, 220) **at a uniform predetermined module spacing; with the antennas spaced from one another by a predetermined distance** (see Chung Fig 3; 212, 224) **that is substantially greater than the module spacing;**

longitudinally subdividing the film strip into film sections (see Chung Fig 3; 222) **each of which is of a length equal to the predetermined module spacing and each of which carries a respective chip module**(see Chung Fig 3; 212)**;**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. by providing panel with plurality of electronics substrate , as taught by Chung., since such a modification would be provide continuous production.

10. Regarding claim 31, Thomas Grasl et al. discloses;

The contacts of the chip module or of the antenna have points (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 5) **so that when pressed against the other contacts they penetrate the other contacts** (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 3)**.**

11. Regarding claim 38, Thomas Grasl et al. does not disclose;

The longitudinal subdivision of the module film strip is carried out before pressing the film sections against the respective antennas on the antenna strip.

However Chung teaches

The longitudinal subdivision of the module film strip (see Chung Fig 3; 222, 220) **is carried out before pressing the film sections against the respective antenna on the antenna strip.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. by providing panel with plurality of electronics substrate , as taught by Chung., since such a modification would be provided continuous production.

12. Regarding claim 41, Thomas Grasl et al. does not disclose;

coating the antenna strip with adhesive prior to pressing the film section and their respective modules against the antenna strip.

However Chung teaches

Coating the antenna strip with adhesive (see Chung Fig 17; 424) **prior to pressing the film section and their respective modules** (see Chung Fig 17; 402) **against the antenna strip** (see Chung Fig 17; 420)**.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. by providing adhesive strip , as taught by Chung., since such a modification would be provide continuous production.

13. Regarding claim 42, Thomas Grasl et al. does not disclose;

The coating with adhesive is only done to discrete regions of the antenna strip adjacent the antenna contacts.

However Chung teaches

The coating with adhesive (see Chung Fig 12; 406) **is only done to discrete**

regions of the antenna strip (see Chung Fig 12; 404) **adjacent the antenna contacts.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. by providing adhesive pattern , as taught by Chung., since such a modification would be provide continuous production.

14. Regarding claim 43, Thomas Grasl et al. does not disclose;

The discrete regions have a size generally corresponding to the module spacing.

However Chung teaches

The discrete regions have a size generally corresponding to the module spacing (see Chung Fig 12; 406) **.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. by providing adhesive pattern , as taught by Chung., since such a modification would be provide continuous production.

15. Regarding claim 51, Thomas Grasl et al. discloses;

The module (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 4) **is associated with two respective module contacts** (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 5) **and the module is secured to the film** (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 1) **between the two respective contacts** (see Thomas Grasl et al. Fig 3; 6,5,4,1)**.**

16. Regarding claim 52, Thomas Grasl et al. does not disclose;

The film strip is flexible and of plastic.

However Chung teaches

The module film is flexible and of plastic (see Chung Fig 3; 220 and column 5; line 14-18) **.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. by providing plastic substrate , as taught by Chung., since such a modification would be provide continuous production.

17. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas Grasl et al., DE 10205914 , in view of Chung , US 6,886,246 and further in view of Kappel et al., US 2003/0229985.

18. Regarding claim 32, Thomas Grasl et al. does not disclose;

The pointed contacts are of pyramidal shape.

However Kappel et al. teaches

The pointed contacts are of pyramidal shape (see Kappel et al. Fig 8; 120)**.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. in view of Chung by providing pyramidal shape contacts, as taught by Kappel et al., since such a modification would provide more conductivity.

19. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas Grasl et al., DE 10205914 , in view of Chung , US 6,886,246 and in view of Kappel et al., US 2003/0229985, as applied to claim 32 above, further in view of Estes et al., US 6,189,208.

20. Regarding claim 33, Thomas Grasl et al. in view of Kappel et al. does not disclose;

Each pointed contact is formed by a multiplicity of particles.

However Estes et al. teaches

Each pointed contact is formed by a multiplicity of particles (see Estes et al. column 5; line 5-16)**.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. in view of Chung and Kappel et al. by providing multiple particles for the pyramidal shape contacts, as taught by Estes et al., since such a modification would be provide more hardness.

21. Claims 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas Grasl et al., DE 10205914 , in view of Chung , US 6,886,246, as applied to claims 35-36,41-43 and 51-52, and further in view of Okamoto et al., US 2004/0253818.

22. Regarding claim 46, Thomas Grasl et al. together with Chung. do not disclose;

rolling up the antenna strip after pressing the film sections against the antenna strip .

However Okamoto et al. teaches

rolling up the antenna strip (see Okamoto et al. Fig 18; 25) **after pressing the film sections** (see Okamoto et al. Fig 15; 5) **against the antenna strip** (see Okamoto et al. Fig 15; 3) **.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. in view of Chung by providing roll , as taught by Okamoto et al., since such a modification would be provide continuous production.

23. Regarding claim 47, Thomas Grasl et al. together with Chung. do not disclose;

Prior to rolling up the antenna strip of inspecting the modules.

However Okamoto et al. teaches

Prior to rolling up the antenna strip of inspecting (see Okamoto et al. Fig 18; 42) **the modules.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. in view of Chung by inspection step, as taught by Okamoto et al., since such a modification would be provide continuous production.

24. Regarding claim 48, Thomas Grasl et al. together with Chung. do not disclose;

after inspecting the modules of marking any modules failing inspection.

However Okamoto et al. teaches

a**fter inspecting the modules of marking** (see Okamoto et al. Fig 18; 45,47) **any modules failing inspection.**

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Thomas Grasl et al. in view of Chung by inspection marking step , as taught by Okamoto et al., since such a modification would be provide continuous production.

Response to Arguments

25. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 30 and 49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

New-matter problem with the cancelled claim 37, now inserted in claim 30 is not solved because examiner couldn't find the exact claim language in the specification.

examiner also couldn't find the exact claim language of cancelled claim 49, now inserted in claim 30 , in the specification.

Conclusion

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AZM PARVEZ whose telephone number is (571)270-1391. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:30 / Alt Fri day off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DERRIS BANKS can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AZM PARVEZ
Examiner
Art Unit 3729

/Derris H Banks/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3729